

### REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on August 2, 2004.

Claims 1, 15, 18, 19 and 20 are amended, no claims are canceled or added; as a result, claims 1 - 30 remain pending in this application.

#### §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 15-17, 20-24, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gourdine (U.S. 5,422,787).

Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 15, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Perdue (U.S. 5,563,768).

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 15-17, 20-24, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bollesen (U.S. 6,304,445).

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991). Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action did not make out a *prima facie* case of anticipation because neither Gourdine, Perdue, or Bollesen teach each and every element of the claims.

First, amended independent claim 1 recites: “a housing adapted to be closely fitted to a heat sink; the housing *having a first end and a second end each configured to receive an interchangeable cooling attachment. . .*” Neither Gourdine, Perdue, or Bollesen teach a housing having a first end and a second each configured to receive an interchangeable cooling attachment.

Second, amended independent claim 15 recites: “a fan interchangeably coupled to the housing, the fan to create a flow of air through the housing *and the fan positioned at a distance from the housing that is about equal to or less than a diameter of the fan.*” Neither Gourdine, Perdue, or Bollesen teach a fan positioned at a distance from the housing that is about equal to or less than a diameter of the fan.

Third, amended independent claim 20 recites: “interchangeably coupling a fan to the housing *at a distance that is about equal to or less than a diameter of the fan.*” Neither

Gourdine, Perdue, or Bollesen teach coupling a fan to the housing at a distance that is about equal to or less than a diameter of the fan.

Fourth, independent claim 28 recites: “*a plurality of interchangeable cooling attachments adapted to be combined with the one or more heat sink housings to form an electronic component cooling system.*” Neither Gourdine, Perdue, or Bollesen teach a plurality of interchangeable cooling attachments.

Furthermore, claims 2 – 6, 9 – 10, 16 – 17, 21 – 24, and 29 – 30 depend, directly or indirectly on allowable independent claims 1, 15, 20 and 28 and are patentable over the references for the reasons argued above, plus the elements of the claims.

Additionally, Applicant does not admit that Bollesen is prior art, and reserves the right to swear behind it at a later date. Nevertheless, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are distinguishable over Bollesen for the reasons argued above.

Thus, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 9, 10, 15-17, 20-24, and 28-30 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gourdine (U.S. 5,422,787).

Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 15, and 20 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Perdue (U.S. 5,563,768).

Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 9, 10, 15-17, 20-24, and 28-30 d under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bollesen (U.S. 6,304,445).

### §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gourdine.

Claims 1 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perdue.

Claims 1 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bollesen.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 6-8 are allowable over Gourdine, Perdue, or Bollesen because each of those references fails to teach every element of the claims as stated above. In addition, the office action acknowledges that Gourdine, Perdue, or Bollesen to teach the fan diameter.

Thus, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6 – 8 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Gourdine, Perdue, or Bollesen.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Claims 18 and 19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended claims 18 and 19 to incorporate the limitations of the base claim. The amendments to claim 18 and 19 are made to put the claims in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 349-9592) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE K. KORINSKY ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 349-9592

Date Febr. 2, 2005

By Ann M. McCrackin  
Ann M. McCrackin  
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 2 day of February 2005.

ANN MCCRACKIN

Name

Ann M. McCrackin

Signature